

RANK ORDER		10				1				12				7				9				13				4				
SELECTION CRITERIA -		Teal				Bartlette Cocke				Drymalla				Times				Brookstone				Gamma				Turner				
POSSIBLE NUMBER OF POINTS																														
Evaluator		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Average Score		77.5				85.5				76.0				80.5				78.0				75.0				82.5				
Totals - Drop High and Low Scores		100	78.0	0.0	0.0	77.0	87.0	0.0	0.0	84.0	74.0	0.0	0.0	78.0	0.0	78.0	0.0	83.0	77.0	0.0	0.0	79.0	72.0	0.0	0.0	78.0	84.0	0.0	0.0	81.0
Totals		100	78.0	64.0	81.0	77.0	87.0	61.0	93.0	84.0	74.0	65.0	94.0	78.0	53.0	78.0	85.0	83.0	77.0	74.0	88.0	79.0	72.0	47.0	91.0	78.0	84.0	69.0	98.0	81.0
1. Completeness of Submittal Response																														
SOQ follows the prescribed format and contains all information requested in the RFQ (provided by PM).		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
2. Experience																														
A. Respondent's experience in similar or relevent projects constructed using CMAR process as described in Section 1, Project Briefs.		20	15	13	15	16	17	9	20	19	14	12	18	17	5	12	17	18	15	13	18	17	16	7	18	18	18	14	20	18
B. Project Manager and Superintendent's experience in similar or relevant projects constructed using CMAR process as described in Section 1, Resumes.		20	15	10	15	16	17	11	16	17	15	10	18	15	5	12	17	17	14	14	18	16	14	7	19	16	18	12	20	17
C. Project experience with the City or other governmental agencies or institutions as described in Section 1 Project Briefs.		5	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	3	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	4	4	2	5	4	4	3	5	5
3. Deadlines and Budget																														
A. Track record of meeting deadlines and working within a budget, as described in Section 3 Narrative and as shown on Project Briefs.		10	8	7	8	7	9	6	10	8	7	8	10	7	7	10	8	7	7	8	9	8	6	6	9	6	9	6	10	7
B. Cost Estimating approach as described in Section 3 Narrative.		10	7	6	7	7	9	7	9	7	7	7	10	7	4	8	9	7	7	7	9	7	6	5	9	7	6	7	9	7
C. Understanding of City's needs (budget versus architectural program) and appropriateness of Firm's approach to this project, as described in Section 3 Narrative.		10	9	6	8	7	9	5	9	8	8	6	10	7	9	8	10	8	8	8	8	7	6	6	8	7	8	7	10	7
4. Quality of Service																														
A. Testimonials as described in Secion 4 Testimonials		10	7	7	10	8	9	8	10	8	7	7	9	8	8	10	7	9	9	8	8	8	9	4	9	8	8	8	10	8
B. Track Record of quality control as described in section 3 Narrative		10	8	6	8	7	8	7	9	7	7	7	9	7	6	8	7	7	8	8	8	7	6	5	9	7	8	7	9	7

RANK ORDER		5				10				1				6				8				3					
SELECTION CRITERIA -		Manhattan				Miner-Dederick				Spaw Maxwell				Satterfield & Pontikes				Durotech				JE Dunn					
POSSIBLE NUMBER OF POINTS																											
Evaluator		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
Average Score		82.0				77.5				85.5				81.0				79.0				83.0					
Totals - Drop High and Low Scores		100	0.0	0.0	82.0	82.0	0.0	76.0	0.0	79.0	88.0	0.0	0.0	83.0	85.0	0.0	0.0	77.0	79.0	0.0	0.0	79.0	89.0	0.0	0.0	77.0	
Totals		100	90.0	74.0	82.0	82.0	72.0	76.0	79.0	79.0	88.0	82.0	89.0	83.0	85.0	60.0	86.0	77.0	79.0	57.0	92.0	79.0	89.0	72.0	97.0	77.0	
1. Completeness of Submittal Response																											
SOQ follows the prescribed format and contains all information requested in the RFQ (provided by PM).		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Experience																											
A. Respondent's experience in similar or relevant projects constructed using CMAR process as described in Section 1, Project Briefs.		20	18	14	15	18	15	16	17	17	17	15	20	19	18	10	20	17	15	11	20	18	19	13	20	17	
B. Project Manager and Superintendent's experience in similar or relevant projects constructed using CMAR process as described in Section 1, Resumes.		20	18	15	15	16	15	17	15	16	18	15	17	16	16	10	17	15	18	12	18	16	18	14	19	15	
C. Project experience with the City or other governmental agencies or Institutions as described in Section 1 Project Briefs.		5	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	2	4	4	3	5	4	4	2	5	4	4	4	5	4	
3. Deadlines and Budget																											
A. Track record of meeting deadlines and working within a budget, as described in Section 3 Narrative and as shown on Project Briefs.		10	9	8	8	8	8	7	9	8	9	8	9	8	8	7	9	7	7	6	10	8	9	8	10	8	
B. Cost Estimating approach as described in Section 3 Narrative.		10	9	7	8	7	6	6	9	7	9	7	9	7	9	6	10	7	8	5	8	7	9	7	10	7	
C. Understanding of City's needs (budget versus architectural program) and appropriateness of Firm's approach to this project, as described in Section 3 Narrative.		10	9	6	9	8	6	6	9	7	9	8	7	8	9	6	7	7	7	5	8	7	9	7	9	7	
4. Quality of Service																											
A. Testimonials as described in Secion 4 Testimonials		10	9	8	9	9	5	7	4	8	8	9	10	9	8	6	5	8	8	4	9	7	8	6	10	7	
B. Track Record of quality control as described in section 3 Narrative		10	9	7	9	7	8	8	8	7	9	10	10	7	8	7	8	7	7	7	9	7	8	8	9	7	